

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 6-9, 11, and 13-16 were pending in the application.

Claims 2-5, 10, and 12 are canceled.

Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13, and 15-16 are hereby amended.

1. Claims 1 and 6-16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Gelman.

The examiner states that Gelman “does not explicitly teach the hooking layer... the translation is being done at source and destination gateways (figures 1 and 7; col. 1, lines 12-47)”. Gelman, in fact, teaches only a proxy mechanism, whereby delayed communications (such as high-delay satellite downlinks) are reconstructed/translated before communicated on to a destination. In the Gelman proxy arrangement, the satellite communications received from the satellite at a source gateway are first proxied to a protocol translator having a different network address from an intended client destination for the communications. The protocol translator operates to reconstruct/translate the communications, and then enables the communications to be transmitted on to the destination gateway and client via the client network address.

Thus, the reconstruction/translation of Gelman that the examiner contends implies “hooking” is not performed at the destination gateway or destination client, but rather occurs at the source gateway and protocol translator of different network address (i.e., a proxy).

In the context of Gelman’s intent and purpose, this makes sense – Gelman assists communication to the client by providing an intermediary (the protocol translator) to

prepare the communication in manner that can be received by the client. Gelman does not, and cannot, deliver the high-delay communications directly to the client, because the client will not handle the delay. The differing network addresses of protocol translator versus the client, make clear that the translation by Gelman does not imply any *hooking of received information at and by the client*.

Applicant's claim amendments more particularly and distinctly point out that the server communicates the entire communication, albeit according to specialized protocols, to the client at the client address. There is not any proxy of communications to a different address, or any delivery of the communications to the client by any intermediate proxy.

The examiner contends that Gelman's destination gateway could be included in the client. Even if so, combined destination gateway/client would have a unique destination address – not the different network address of the Gelman the proxy. Gelman requires proxy, at the different address for the proxy, in order to perform any reconstruction/translation of the communicated information.

Applicant's claims, instead, are directed to hooking of received communications at and by the client. The client hooking layer makes appropriate data of the received communications useable by an application program of the client. In other words, Applicant's claims address received communications and hooking at the client to discern data for, and in suitable format for use by, the client application program according to the program's standard formatting requirements for use of data.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all remaining claims, as here amended.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the undersigned attorney for Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any issues. The Office is authorized to charge any excess fees or to credit any overage to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2007

By: /H. Dale Langley, Jr./
H. Dale Langley, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,927

The Law Firm of H. Dale Langley, Jr.
610 West Lynn
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: (512) 477-3830
Facsimile: (512) 480-0858
E-Mail: dlangley@iptechlaw.com